

### **REMARKS**

The Applicants have now had an opportunity to carefully consider the comments set forth in the Office Action that was mailed April 13, 2009. All of the rejections are respectfully traversed. Amendment, re-examination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

#### **The Office Action**

In the Office Action that was mailed April 13, 2009:

the specification was objected to for making reference to other applications without reciting their respective serial numbers;

the specification was objected to for allegedly not including a Summary;

**claims 26-44** were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0015559 A1 to Goldstein ("Goldstein") and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0015570 A1 to Khemani et al. ("Khemani").

#### **The Present Application**

By way of brief review, the present application is directed toward a system for remotely supporting a family of products even when the products are deployed in the field. For example, as recited in independent claim 36, embodiments include a system for remotely supporting a family of document processing products even when the document processing products are deployed in the field. The system provides for an interchangeable device model. For example, each device model (122, 123) provides the system with information regarding classes of information that can be communicated to and from a respective product of the family of products. Additionally, a respective device model includes at least identifications of classes of information that can be communicated to and/or from each of the products of the family of products. A device model agent is operative to use information in the device model to provide communication services between a respective unit associated with the device model and other system elements, such as a services host server. The device model agent (or code therefor) can be reused in a wide variety of products or in association

therewith. The device model can be customized on a device-by-device basis. Accordingly, the system can support a broad family of products without the need to write and/or update custom code in association with each product. Instead, all that need be provided for the system to support a new or revised product is a new or revised device model for that product. The claimed device model or interchangeable device model and model agent hide the details of devices from other parts of the system and thereby allow a single system to support a wide variety of products.

### The Cited Documents

In contrast, the primary reference of the Office Action to Goldstein **does not disclose or suggest** an interchangeable device model or a device model agent that is operative to read and use information from the device model. Even if Goldstein discusses an apparatus and method for providing customer service, Goldstein does not disclose or suggest the same apparatus and methods disclosed in the present application and recited in **claims 26-44**. While cited paragraph 33 makes reference to a --model number-- of an apparatus, and discusses a transmitted message including a product identifier, paragraph 33 **does not disclose or suggest** an interchangeable device model which includes identifications of classes of information that can be communicated to and/or from each of the products of the family of products and mappings indicating how the classes of information can be communicated to or from the first product as alleged by the Office Action. Even if, as alleged by the Office Action, paragraph 33 indicates that information about a device is provided to a representative and even if paragraph 33 indicated that a router is configured to ensure a message from the apparatus is routed or mapped to a terminal, that **does not disclose or suggest** that a device model agent reads information from a device model including mappings indicating how classes of information can be communicated to or from the product that mapping information to facilitate communications between the product and another system element. Goldstein does not disclose or suggest an interchangeable device model (e.g., see 122 of Fig. 13 of the present application).

Similarly, contrary to the assertions of the Office Action, reference numeral 107 of Fig. 4 of Goldstein, which merely indicates --provide customer service representative

with information necessary to diagnose user's problem--, does not disclose or suggest at least one representative device model agent that is operative to read the interchangeable device model. Additionally, reference numeral 107 does not disclose or suggest a device model agent that is operative to access information in at least one respective unit and to provide information to the at least one respective unit according to the interchangeable device model. Even if the cited element of Fig. 4 could be construed to suggest communicating with at least one other element of a system regarding at least one unit over a communication's link, reference numeral 107 of Fig. 4 does not disclose or suggest that a device model agent performs such communication.

It is respectfully submitted that the secondary reference of the Office Action to Khemani does not cure the deficiencies of Goldstein. For example, the Office Action does not allege that Khemani discloses or suggests the elements of **claim 26** discussed above. Furthermore, **Khemani is not available as a reference** against the claims of the present application. **The present application was filed on October 16, 2003.** Khemani resulted from an application filed on June 29, **2005** which claims priority to a provisional application that was filed on June 30, **2004**. Accordingly, the present application predates Khemani, and Khemani is not available as prior art against the claims of the present application.

#### **The Cross-Reference**

The Office Action objects to the specification because the cross-reference does not include application serial numbers.

However, the specification has been amended to include the requested serial numbers. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

#### **The Specification Includes a Summary**

The Office Action objects to the specification for not including a summary. In this regard, the Applicants respectfully submit that 37 CFR §1.71 indicates what must be included in the specification and that 37 CFR §1.73 only suggests that a summary "should" precede the detailed description. Accordingly, there is no requirement that a

summary be provided or labeled. Nevertheless, in the interest of compact prosecution, the specification has been amended to identify a summary portion. For the foregoing reasons, withdrawal of the objection to the specification for failure to include a brief summary is respectfully requested.

### **The Claims Are Not Obvious**

**Claims 26-44** were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldstein in view of Khemani.

However, the present application was filed on October 16, 2003 and claims priority to provisional applications filed in mid-October of 2002, while Khemani is a U.S. patent application publication, which was published on January 19, 2006 from an application filed on June 29, 2005 and claiming priority to a provisional application filed on June 30, 2004. Accordingly, **Khemani is not prior art** with respect to the claims of the present application.

For the foregoing reasons, to the extent that Khemani is relied on, **claims 26-44** are not anticipated and are not obvious in light of Goldstein and Khemani.

However, it is noted that with regard to many of the claims, the Office Action only includes citations to Goldstein. Accordingly, the substance of those rejections are addressed as follows.

With regard to the interchangeable device model recited in independent **claim 26**, the Office Action cites portions of paragraph 33 of Goldstein.

However, paragraph 33 indicates that a product identifier is included in a message that is transmitted to a customer service representative and that a routing device may be configured to ensure that the message is routed to a terminal that is used by a customer service representative that is familiar with the design of the apparatus. Paragraph 33 **does not disclose or suggest** an interchangeable device model. While paragraph 33 indicates that a product identifier may be a model number, that does not disclose or suggest an interchangeable device model of the type recited in **claim 26**. For example, the device model of **claim 26** includes identifications of classes of information that can be communicated to and from each of the products of a family of products. Furthermore, the device model of **claim 26** includes mappings indicating how

the classes of information can be communicated to and/or from the first product. It is respectfully submitted that a customer service representative is not a product. Additionally, it is noted that the assertions of the Office Action appear to be inconsistent. The assertions first appear to draw an analogy between the apparatus 15 of Goldstein and the device or first product recited in **claim 26**. Then the Office Action refers to a mapping to the terminal of the customer service representative of Goldstein as if it were analogous to the device or first product recited in **claim 26**. It is respectfully submitted that this inconsistency is symptomatic of the fact that Goldstein **does not disclose or suggest** the types of components recited in **claim 26** or the inter-relationships of components recited in **claim 26** of the present application.

With regard to the recitation of at least one respective device model agent in **claim 26**, the Office Action cites reference numeral 107 of Fig. 4 of Goldstein.

However, reference numeral 107 identifies a step described as: "provide customer service representative with information necessary to diagnose user's problem." It is respectfully submitted that the mere indication that a customer service representative is provided with information **does not disclose or suggest** that the information is provided to the customer service representative by at least one device model agent that is operative to read the interchangeable device model and access information in the at least one respective unit and to provide information to the at least one respective unit according to the interchangeable device model.

For at least the foregoing reasons, **claim 26**, as well as **claim 27-35**, which depend therefrom, is not anticipated and is not obvious in light of Goldstein and Khemani.

With regard to the recitation of a services host server, the Office Action cites reference numeral 55 of Fig. 1 and paragraph 33 of Goldstein.

However, neither Fig. 1 nor the cited paragraph disclose or suggest that the cited customer service system is operative to exchange information with the at least one respective device model agent as is recited in **claim 26**. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that the Office is applying **impermissible hindsight reasoning** to read the vague discussion of a model number of the apparatus or any other type of information that allows a customer service representative to identify the apparatus or a component

of the apparatus included in the first sentence of paragraph 33 as disclosing or suggesting the particular details recited in the description of the services host server of **claim 26** including unit configuration parameters, unit status information, available upgrade information, selected upgrade information, selected downgrade information, available update information, requested update information, an error message, and service request information.

For at least the foregoing additional reasons, **claim 26**, as well as **claims 27-35**, which depend therefrom, is not anticipated and is not obvious in light of Goldstein and Khemani.

With regard to **claim 27**, the Office Action cites lines 17-24 of paragraph 33 of Goldstein in regard to the recitation in **claim 27** of a second interchangeable device model for a second product selected from the family of device models wherein the second interchangeable device model includes mappings indicating how the classes of information can be communicated to and/or from the second product.

However, the cited portion of paragraph 33 indicates that a routing device, based on the product identifier transmitted from the apparatus, may be configured to ensure that the message from the apparatus is routed to a terminal that is used by a customer service representative who is familiar with the design of the apparatus or of the component identified by the product identifier. It is respectfully submitted that discussion of routing a message to a person that is familiar with a product identified in the message does not disclose or suggest a second interchangeable device model as recited in **claim 27**.

For at least the foregoing additional reasons, **claim 27** is not anticipated and is not obvious in light of Goldstein and Khemani.

With regard to the recitation of at least one respective copy of the device model agent, the Office Action again cites reference numeral 55 of Fig. 1 and paragraph 33, lines 1-5.

In this regard, arguments similar to those submitted above with regard to **claim 26** and the recitation of the device model agent therein are submitted in support of **claim 27**. The depiction of the customer service system 55 in Fig. 1 and the indication that a product identifier is included in a message included in the cited portion of

paragraph 33 **does not disclose or suggest** at least one respective copy of the device model agent that is operative to read the second interchangeable device model and access information in the at least one second respective unit of the second product, as is recited in **claim 27**.

**Claim 28** recites at least one service provider that is operative to exchange information with the services host over at least one communications link and to provide at least one of: updated software, software upgrades, billing services, maintenance services and repair services for the at least one unit according to at least one of the unit's status information, the selected upgrade information, the requested update information, the error message and the service request information received from the at least one unit.

In this regard, the Office Action again relies on reference numeral 107 of Fig. 4 and lines 1-5 of paragraph 33 of Goldstein.

However, **claim 28** recites an additional system element, i.e., at least one services provider. It is respectfully submitted that depiction of providing a customer service representative with information necessary to diagnose a user's problem does not disclose or suggest the services provided or recited in **claim 28**. Lines 1-5 of paragraph 33 indicate that a product identifier included in a message may be a model number or other type of identifying information. It is respectfully submitted that the indication that a product identifier may be a model number does not disclose or suggest at least one services provider as recited in **claim 28**. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that only impermissible hindsight reasoning could lead one to read the cited portions of Goldstein as disclosing or suggesting the at least one services provider recited in **claim 28**.

For at least the foregoing additional reasons, **claim 28** is not anticipated and is not obvious in light of Goldstein and Khemani.

With regard to **claim 29**, the Office Action only cites reference numerals 25 and 32 of Fig. 2 of Goldstein.

However, nothing in the depiction of memory 25 and processing element 32 of the electric apparatus of Fig. 2 discloses or suggests that a device model agent is at least one of implemented as a process included in the at least one respective unit and

implemented within a physical add-on module that is connected to the respective at least one unit. Fig. 2 does not disclose or suggest a device model agent. Nothing in the depiction of generic control logic 21 or generic App. Program 34 discloses or suggests a device model agent such as is recited in **claim 26**.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that only impermissible hindsight reasoning would lead one to interpret the depiction of memory 25 and processing element 32 of Fig. 2 as disclosing or suggesting a device model agent implemented as recited in **claim 29**.

For at least the foregoing additional reasons, **claim 29** is not anticipated and is not obvious in light of Goldstein and Khemani.

With regard to **claim 30**, the Office Action cites reference numerals 52A-52E of Fig. 1 and reference numeral 52 of Fig. 3.

However, the cited reference numerals depict customer service terminals. It is respectfully submitted that the customer service terminals of Goldstein display messages to customer service representatives and allows a customer service representative to transmit voice data to request information from a user of a device or apparatus (e.g., paragraph 37). It is respectfully submitted that Goldstein **does not disclose or suggest** that a customer service terminal 52 is an application server that is operative to receive application software modules from at least one service provider and make the software application modules available for transmission to an installation in the at least one respective device model agent for performing new services in conjunction with the at least one respective unit as is recited in **claim 30**.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that only impermissible hindsight reasoning would lead one to read the discussion of the terminals 52 of Goldstein as being application servers as recited in **claim 30**.

For at least the foregoing additional reasons, **claim 30** is not anticipated and is not obvious in light of Goldstein and Khemani.

With regard to **claim 32**, the Office Action cites lines 16-21 of paragraph 28 of Goldstein.



However, the cited portion indicates that the customer service terminal 52A includes a communications interface that allows the terminal 52A to exchange data with the network 42. The interface may be wireless or non-wireless.

However, **claim 32** recites an application programming interface. It is respectfully submitted that Goldstein **does not disclose or suggest** that the customer service terminal 52A is an application programming interface. Furthermore, **claim 32** indicates that the application programming interface is operative to select one or more communication means from available communication means. It is respectfully submitted that the cited portion of paragraph 28 **does not disclose or suggest** that the customer service terminal is operative to select one or more communication means from an available set of communication means.

For at least the foregoing additional reasons, **claim 32** is not anticipated and is not obvious in light of Goldstein and Khemani.

With regard to **claim 33**, the Office Action cites lines 4 and 5 of paragraph 41 of Goldstein.

However, the cited lines indicate that the apparatus 15 and terminal 52 may exchange data via internet protocol (IP). It is respectfully submitted that the cited portion **does not disclose or suggest** an application programming interface. Furthermore, the cited portion does not disclose or suggest an application programming interface that supports communication by at least HTTP, HTTPS, JMS, email, 10BaseT, 100BaseT, 10Base2, Modem, IEEE 802.11X, and Bluetooth, protocols as recited in **claim 33**.

For at least the foregoing additional reasons, **claim 33** is not anticipated and is not obvious in light of Goldstein and Khemani.

With regard to **claim 34**, the Office Action cites lines 5-10 of paragraph 47.

However, the cited portion indicates that control logic 21 may be configured to transmit portions of diagnostic data upon request by either the user or the customer service representative. Furthermore, the cited section indicates, the control logic 21 may be configured to respond to commands transmitted from the terminal 52A just as if the commands were entered by the user of the apparatus 15. It is respectfully submitted that the cited portion does not disclose or suggest **a device model agent** or

that a **device model agent** is further operative to at least one of: add at new service received from an applications server to the device model agent, start a service running and stop a service, as recited in **claim 34**.

The Office Action stipulates that Goldstein does not disclose the subject matter of **claim 31** and relies on Khemani for disclosure of at least one of the at least one respective device model agent is at least one of: implemented as a device proxy and implemented as a device proxy within the applications server.

However, as indicated above, even if this assertion were true, **Khemani is not available as a reference** against the claims of the present application.

For at least the foregoing additional reasons, **claim 31** is not anticipated and is not obvious in light of Goldstein and Khemani.

The Office Action asserts that **claims 36-44** are system claims corresponding to system **claims 26-34**, respectively, and are rejected under the same reason set forth in the rejection of **claims 26-34**, above.

To the extent that this assertion is accurate, arguments similar to those submitted in support of **claims 26-34** are submitted in support of **claims 36-44**.

Additionally, it is noted that **claims 36-44** are directed toward a system for remotely supporting a family of document processing products and recite aspects particular thereto. For example, **claim 36** recites a services host server that is operative to exchange information including at least one of: unit billing meter configuration parameters, billing meter readings, unit document processor consumables supply information, available document processor functions that can be added to the unit, selected document processor functions to be added to the unit, selected document processor functions to be deleted from the capabilities of the unit.

**Claim 37** also recites aspects particular to a second document processing product.

**Claim 38** recites aspects related to the unit document processor consumables status information and the selected document processing functions to be added to the unit.

For at least the foregoing additional reasons, **claims 36-44** are not anticipated and are not obvious in light of Goldstein and Khemani.

**Telephone Interview**

In the interests of advancing this application to issue the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to discuss the foregoing or any suggestions that the Examiner may have to place the case in condition for allowance.

**CONCLUSION**

Claims 26-44 remain in the application. For at least the foregoing reasons, the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, an early indication thereof is respectfully requested.

☒ Remaining Claims, as delineated below:

(1) FOR	(2) CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT LESS HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR		(3) NUMBER EXTRA
TOTAL CLAIMS	19	- 25 =	0
INDEPENDENT CLAIMS	2	- 4 =	0

☒ This is an authorization under 37 CFR 1.136(a)(3) to treat any concurrent or future reply, requiring a petition for extension of time, as incorporating a petition for the appropriate extension of time.

☒ The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any filing or prosecution fees which may be required, under 37 CFR 1.16, 1.17, and 1.21 (but not 1.18), or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account 24-0037.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call Thomas Tillander, at Telephone Number (216) 363-9000.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY SHARPE LLP

  
Patrick R. Roche, Reg. No. 29,580  
Thomas Tillander, Reg. No. 47,334  
The Halle Building – Fifth Floor  
1228 Euclid Avenue  
Cleveland, OH 44115  
216-363-9000

June 4, 2009  
Date